

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,520	06/27/2001	James P. Kardach	42390P11689	5997

7590 02/04/2003

Michael J. Mallie
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMBERLY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/894,520	KARDACH, JAMES P.	
	Examiner Kimberly D. Nguyen	Art Unit 2876	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
Status			
1) <input type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.			
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL . 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.			
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of:			
1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.			
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-6, 10-16 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magnus et al. (WO 02/082359; hereinafter "Magnus") as modified by Zdybel, Jr. et al. (US 5,486,686; hereinafter "Zdybel, Jr.").

Re claims 1-2, 4-6, 10-14, 16 and 20-25: Magnus teaches a method comprising:
printing a hardcopy representation/coupon 9 of an electronic application on a paper
having printed pattern thereon (page 3, line 29 through page 4, line 10);
recording one or more edits made with a pen 1 on the hard copy representation 14 by
recording movements of the pen 1 with respect to the printed pattern (fig. 1; page 7, lines 16-34;
page 9, line 16 through page 10, line 21);
automatically sending the one or more edits made on the hard copy representation 14, via
wireless transmission, to a computer system (figs. 2-3; page 7, line 35 through page 8, line 17;
page 9, lines 16-35).

Although, Magnus teaches a unique printed pattern paper can be used for identifying a particular publisher (page 4, lines 4-6); Magnus fails or fairly suggests that the hard copy representation having identification information to associate the hard copy representation with the electronic application.

Zdybel, Jr. teaches a method of a hard copy representation having identification information, such as file name, to associate the hard copy representation with the electronic application (col. 10, lines 1-27).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the notoriously old and well known identification information associating the hard copy and the electronic application as taught by Zdybel, Jr. to the teachings of Magnus in order to keep track of the hard copy with the electronic application.

Re claims 3, 15: Magnus teaches a method, wherein recording the information, such as winners, match results, number etc, comprises making a mark with the pen in the area/box with specific information (page 5, lines 1-3; page 8, lines 12-17).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manipulate the information such as the identification information, as necessary, to fit his/her business criteria to further inform the computer system of file(s) being edited or changed. Furthermore, such modifications would provide an inventory tracking of files/application being changed, edited or updated.

3. Claims 7-9 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magnus as modified by Zdybel, Jr. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Patton et al. (US 5,757,468; hereinafter “Patton”). The teachings of Magnus as modified by Zdybel, Jr. have been discussed above.

Magnus as modified by Zdybel, Jr. is silent with respect to the identification information comprises an ID printed with an icon on the hard copy representation.

Patton teaches a print paper/hard copy wherein the identification information comprises a unique identification number "000001" and a bar code 320, which serves as an ID, with an icon 12 on the print paper (fig. 11; col. 7, lines 55-67).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manipulate the informative data with an icon as taught by Patton to the teachings of Magnus as modified by Zdybel, Jr. in order to provide a visual acknowledgment of the information (i.e. ID) printed with an icon to the operator to further offer an aesthetic appeal to the hard copy.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bell teaches image with sound playback apparatus wherein an icon 12 is on the image.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-1798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-1341 for regular communications and 703-305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-8792.

Application/Control Number: 09/894,520
Art Unit: 2876

Page 5

KDN
January 27, 2003



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800